REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims.

By way of the present Amendment, claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 13, 16 and 18 have been amended. Claims 2-24 currently are pending.

In the Office Action, claim 21 is objected to for failing to further limit the subject matter of claim 2. The above amendment to claim 2 broadens this claim in some respects and removes any specific mention of "ceramic" in connection with the recited film. It is respectfully submitted that the present amendment to claim 2 fully addresses the concerns regarding claim 21 expressed in the paragraph spanning on pages 2 to 3 of the Action.

In pages 4 to 6, the Office Action includes rejections of claims 2-21 under Section 112, first and second paragraphs, in connection with the recitation "wherein said reactive gas is introduced into said reaction chamber in a direction toward the surface of the object," as recited in claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 13, 16 and 18. In response, Applicants have removed this recitation from each of the pending independent claims. It is respectfully submitted that these amendments obviate that rejections under Section 112. Accordingly, these rejections should be withdrawn.

Starting on page 7 of the Action, claims 2-24 are rejected under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-19 of U.S. Patent No. 6,660,342 (Miyanaga et al.) in view of Matsuo et al. (U.S. Patent No 4,401,054), and over claims 1-15 of U.S. Patent No. 5,626,922 (Miyanaga et al.) in view of Matsuo et al. Also, claims 2-9 and 21-24 are rejected under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 31-83 of U.S. Patent No. 6,110,542 (Miyanaga et al.) in view of Matsuo et al. In response, Applicants attach herewith a terminal disclaimer with respect to U.S. Patent Nos. 6,660,342, 6,110,542, and 5,626,922. It is respectfully submitted that the attached terminal disclaimer overcomes all pending rejections under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. Accordingly, the rejections should be withdrawn.

This application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, and prompt notification of the same is earnestly sought. Should the Examiner believe a residual issue remains that may be resolved by way of a telephonic discussion with the undersigned, he is

invited to contact the undersigned to arrange such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____
John F. Guay
Registration No. 47,248

NIXON PEABODY LLP
401 9th Street, N.W., Suite 900
Washington, D.C. 20004-2128
(202) 585-8000 – Telephone
(202) 585-8080 – FAX